

## Cumulative Table of Cases

### Connecticut Appellate Reports

### Volume 183

---

<p><b>Emeritus Senior Living v. Lepore</b> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Contracts; action to collect unpaid balance due for assisted living services; motion for summary judgment; whether trial court improperly found that residency agreement was unenforceable due to procedural or substantive flaws; whether record revealed that defendant had no meaningful choice whether to select plaintiff as provider of assisted living services; whether agreement was sufficiently clear as written to provide reasonable notice to defendant, as representative, to pay all sums due for services rendered; whether agreement plainly and unambiguously imposed personal liability on defendant in representative capacity for amounts owed to plaintiff; whether agreement was substantively unconscionable; whether agreement to ensure payment for services rendered was so unreasonable as to be unconscionable and, therefore, unenforceable; whether trial court erred by finding residency agreement unenforceable as matter of public policy.</i></p>	23
<p><b>Kargul v. Smith</b> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Summary process; landlord and tenant; notice to quit; withdrawal of summary process complaint; claim that plaintiffs terminated lease agreement between parties by serving initial notice to quit possession in first action, and thereby deprived trial court of jurisdiction to entertain second summary process action commenced by plaintiffs; whether continuation of lease agreement between parties was restored when plaintiffs withdrew first action against defendants prior to commencement of hearing on merits.</i></p>	78
<p><b>State v. Dubuisson</b> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Strangulation in second degree; whether evidence was sufficient for jury to have found beyond reasonable doubt that defendant committed strangulation in second degree; whether jury reasonably and logically could have concluded that defendant put his hand around victim's neck with intent to render her unable to breathe and, while acting under that intent, squeezed her neck with his fingers, thereby rendering her unable to breathe; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting into evidence, under spontaneous utterance exception to hearsay rule, testimony regarding victim's statements to friend during telephone conversation; claim that because there was break in time between when defendant strangled victim and victim called friend, statements were not spontaneous.</i></p>	62
<p><b>State v. Fletcher</b> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Violation of probation; claim that appeal was moot because there was no practical relief that could be afforded to defendant, who had completed sentence for violating probation; whether appeal qualified for exception to mootness doctrine; whether there was reasonable possibility that, in event that defendant were to face sentencing court in future, court's determination revoking his probation and sentencing him to period of incarceration could subject him to prejudicial collateral consequences; whether there was reasonable possibility that presence of defendant's sentence for violation of probation could subject him to prejudicial collateral consequences affecting his employment opportunities and his standing in community generally; whether there was practical relief that could be afforded to defendant; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly relied on fact that was not part of record when it found that defendant had tried to elude law enforcement in their efforts to serve violation of probation warrant; whether information on which court relied satisfied requisite standard of reliability; whether defendant demonstrated that inference drawn by court was unreasonable or unjustifiable.</i></p>	1
<p><b>State v. Morice W.</b> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Risk of injury to child; assault in third degree; whether prosecutor's remark during closing argument to jury about victim's pain denied defendant fair trial; whether defendant denied fair trial as result of improper remark by prosecutor in closing argument to jury that venireperson during voir dire had described victim as voiceless.</i></p>	32
<p><b>State v. Smith</b> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Criminal possession of firearm; possession of weapon in motor vehicle; carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether evidence was sufficient to support</i></p>	54

*conviction of criminal possession of firearm, possession of weapon in motor vehicle, and carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether jury reasonably could have found that defendant had handgun in his vehicle for which he did not have permit and was guilty as charged.*